DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 878 24 TE 500 179

By- Braddock, Richard; Statler, Charles R.
EVALUATION OF COLLEGE-LEVEL INSTRUCTION IN FRESHMAN COMPOSITION. PART II.
Iowa Univ., Iowa City.
Spons Agency- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Report No- CRP-S-260
Bureau No- BR-5-8379
Pub Date Apr 68
Contract- OEC-6-10-302
Note- 77p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.16
Descriptors- *COLLEGE FRESHMEN, *COMPOSITION (LITERARY), COMPOSITION SKILLS (LITERARY), *CURRICULUM RESEARCH, EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTS, ENGLISH, *ENGLISH CURRICULUM, *EVALUATION METHODS, GRADING, GROUP TESTS, HIGHER EDUCATION, STATISTICAL DATA, STUDENT TESTING, WRITING SKILLS
Identifiers- University of Iowa Iowa City

To supplement an experiment at the University of Northern Iowa on the effectiveness of college-level instruction in freshman composition, the University of Iowa conducted its own experiment on the evaluation of freshman composition. This experiment was designed to determine (1) which method of rating papers is more reliable--the "general impression" method of the Educational Testing Service or the "analytical" method used at the University of Iowa, (2) if a more significant measure of writing quality is obtained when the better of two papers, rather than merely one, is used as a criterion, and (3) if the writing performance of students completing the University's rhetoric course improved more than that of students excused from the course. The procedures by which theme raters and experimental and control groups of students were selected are described in detail, as are the methods of rating themes. Chapters discussing findings, conclusions, and recommendations indicate that the results of the experiment were inconclusive because the rating of the themes was not reliable. Included in the report are extensive tables of data and appendixes listing information about and instructions to participants in the experiment. (BN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR-5-8379
PA-24

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE-LEVEL INSTRUCTION IN FRESHMAN COMPOSITION: PART II

Cooperative Research Project No. S-260
Richard Braddock and Charles R. Statler
University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
52240

TE500179
ED021878

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE-LEVEL INSTRUCTION
IN FRESHMAN COMPOSITION: PART II

Cooperative Research Project No. S-260
OE-6-10-302

Richard Braddock
University of Iowa

Charles R. Statler
University of South Carolina
(formerly of
University of Iowa)

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

April, 1968

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PROBLEM 1

II. PROCEDURE 4

Selection and Motivation of Students
Selection of Raters
Theme Rating

III. FINDINGS 16

Analytical versus Impression Rating
Better of Two Papers versus One Paper
Rhetoric Students versus Excused Students

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 25

Appendices

A. Letters to Students--and One Response 29

B. Rhetoric Experiment Questionnaire 42

C. Instructions to Students Writing Themes 45

D. Instructions to Raters 50

E. Experience of Raters 56

F. Analyses of Theme Ratings 59

G. Effectiveness of Speech Instruction in the Rhetoric Program 65

Tables

1. Distribution of Faculty Total Score Ratings 8

2. Distribution of Faculty Category Ratings 9

3. Ratings of All Categories by Each Judge 11

4. Comparison of Total Scores of Pairs of Judges 12

5. Reliability of U of I and ETS Ratings Determined by the Pearson Product-Moment Formula 17

6. Student Appraisal of Preparation for Writing in Courses Other than Rhetoric 23

7. Student Inclination to Elect Rhetoric 24

8. Means of Better Scores on Theme 3 or 4 60

9. Means of Sums of Scores on Themes 3 and 4 61

10. Mean Gains Between Better Themes 62

11. Mean Gains Between Themes 1 and 3 63

12. Mean Subtotals of First Three Categories 64

I

PROBLEM

Several years ago the University of Northern Iowa initiated a project to test the effectiveness of college-level instruction in freshman composition. Briefly, the experiment involved excusing from the freshman composition course at each of five institutions during the academic year 1964-65 some 325 entering freshmen matched with other entering freshmen taking the course. The UNI experiment intended to reach some generalizations about the effectiveness of freshman composition courses in general. It sought to do this by conducting the experiment at five different campuses, each of which had a somewhat different type of freshman composition course. The University of Iowa was one of the institutions cooperating with the University of Northern Iowa in this large project. (At the U of I, freshman composition has been taught, along with public speaking, in "integrated courses" offered by the Rhetoric Program.)

To test the effectiveness of the experiment, the students in the Experimental Group (those excused from the course) and the students in the Control Group (those taking the course as usual) were to be examined on four occasions: September, 1964; January, 1965; June, 1965; and June, 1966. On all four occasions, the testing included a two-hour theme examination and two one-hour objective English, tests, the College Entrance Examination Board test and the Cooperative Test of English Expression. The themes were to be evaluated at UNI after each testing occasion by raters brought from various educational institutions for that purpose and directed by Fred Godshalk of the Educational Testing Service. For a detailed account of the pilot study which preceded the five-institutuion project, see the Interim Report.[1]

Several considerations prompted the University of Iowa to undertake a small experiment to supplement the larger project directed at UNI:

1. As has been shown by a number of investigators,[2] the day-to-day writing performance of college freshmen varies, especially the performance of better writers. Consequently, if a large number of the better writers happened to perform in a mediocre fashion on the post-test themes, they would tend to offset the theme results

---

[1] Ross M. Jewell, John Cowley, and Gordon Rhum, The Effectiveness of College-Level Instruction in Freshman Composition: Interim Report, USOE Project No. 2188 (Cedar Falls: University of Northern Iowa, December, 1966).

[2] Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer, Research in Written Composition (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963), pp. 6-7.

of the better writers who performed well. There seemed to be a serious danger, then, with only one theme being written on each of the four testing occasions, that the UNI experiment would yield no significant differences, like so many experiments of this type.

2. Because the ETS raters would know which papers were pretest themes and which were posttest themes, their judgments of the quality of those papers might be affected by that knowledge and hence should not be used to determine whether or not the freshman composition instruction yielded significant improvement in the writing of the students. Even though the rating could be used to determine the extent to which the Experimental Group or Control Group was superior to the other on each testing occasion, one would not be able to say confidently that the difference was due to the improvement of one group rather than to the deterioration of the other group.

3. Under the ETS system, each rater judges 20 to 30 themes an hour, sometime more. One may hypothesize that, proceeding at such a speed, a rater may tend unconsciously to base his judgments largely on style of writing and mechanics, letting a quick impression of those factors color his judgment of the writer's basic analysis, organization and substance. At the U of I, although Rhetoric instructors typically mark matters of style and mechanics on themes, they usually spend little class time in instruction on those matters, placing more emphasis on the analysis, organization, and support of ideas. Furthermore, while the ETS raters rapidly read a paper and assign it a number from one through nine as a general impression of its merit, in its departmental writing examinations the Rhetoric Program has used an analytical method of grading: Each paper is graded on each of five categories, four of them from one to five points, the fifth from one to three points. The points on the five categories are then added, yielding a total score which may range from five to twenty-three points. Typically, U of I instructors rate from six to eight themes an hour using this analytical system. In brief, there was concern that the ETS rating system would not evaluate well the matters emphasized in the Rhetoric Program at the U of I.

The small U of I project has sought to supplement the large UNI experiment by having the students in the Experimental Group and those in the Control Group at the University of Iowa write a second theme for the pretest (September, 1964) and for the most demanding of the posttest situations (June, 1966, at least a year after the date that the Control Group student had completed his work in the freshman Rhetoric Program). Then the better of each student's pretest themes and the better of his posttest themes would be utilized in judging the effectiveness of the composition component of the freshman course. Furthermore, by having U of I raters judge not only the extra pretest and posttest themes but also the regular themes written on those two occasions, it would be possible to contrast the effectiveness of the general impression and analytical methods of grading, inasmuch as some of the papers would be judged under both systems. Finally, by saving both pretest and both posttest papers until the conclusion of the experiment, the U of I raters could rate all four papers at the same time, not knowing which were pretest and which posttest themes and hence permitting a valid determination of the improvement of writing between the two tests.

Briefly, then, this study has sought to supplement the larger UNI experiment by seeking answers to these questions:

1. At the college freshman-sophomore level of writing, which is a more reliable method of rating papers--the U of I "analytical" method or the ETS "general impression" method?

2. At the college freshman-sophomore level, can a more significant measure of writing be obtained when the criterion used is the better of two papers, rather than merely one paper?

3. Has the writing performance of students who have taken Rhetoric at the University of Iowa improved significantly more than that of matched students who have been excused from the course?

II

PROCEDURE

A description of the Rhetoric Program will clarify the nature of the experiment. The Program will be described as it was in 1964-65.

All entering freshmen were required to register for Rhetoric. On the basis of his scores on the American College Test, the student was assigned either to 10:3, an accelerated one-semester course, or to 10:1 and subsequently to 10:2, the regular two-semester course. No matter which course the student took, he received instruction in written composition, in public speaking, and, often in a much less deliberate manner, in the reading of nonfictive prose. In each of those courses, the instructor was expected to assign at least eleven themes (400-500 words), eight speeches (about four minutes), and some ten reading assignments for which there was some written follow-up. (The departmental theme and speech examinations were usually counted toward those minima.) The 10:1 course emphasized exposition in writing, speaking, and reading: formulating a central idea, organizing discourse, and supporting generalizations with facts, examples, and other material. Although the instructor might spend some time in class on sentence style and diction, he was expected to treat the more obvious matters of grammar, usage, and mechanics only as he marked individual papers. In 10:2, the emphasis was on critical thinking, the writing of a research paper, and argumentative writing and speaking. The instructors of the accelerated course, 10:3, usually spent two or three weeks on expository writing and speaking, and then emphasized the same considerations that they would in 10:2. The courses were taught largely by part-time graduate assistants pursuing advanced degrees either in the Department of English (about 60 per cent) or the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art (about 40 per cent). About two-thirds of the graduate assistants were working on the Ph.D. degree and had taught before that year, either in the Rhetoric Program or at some other college or university.

During their initial registration period when they first arrived on campus, the students assigned to 10:3 were given an opportunity to test out of the Rhetoric requirement by taking a two-hour theme exam and a four-minute extemporaneous speaking exam. If a student did at least B- work on each of these exams, he was excused from the Rhetoric requirement--and hence from the experiment. If he did well on the speech exam only, he could transfer from 10:3 to 10:4, a two-hour course in the writing aspect of 10:3. If he did well on the writing exam but not on the speech exam, he transferred from 10:3 to 36:25, a public-speaking course offered by the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art. Students transferred to 10:4 were kept in the experiment; those transferred to 36:25, of course, were not.

Selection and Motivation of Students

In April, 1964, the selection of students for the Experimental Group took place while the students were still in high school. The sampling procedures established by UNI for the larger experiment were followed in detail at the U of I. Although these procedures undoubtedly will be described in detail in the forthcoming final report of the larger experiment, a brief description is made here. Working with the Tentative Admission Statements of 1,748 prospective freshmen for whom ACT scores were already available, a tabulation was made of the total number of males and of females achieving each standard score on the English composition subtest of the ACT battery. Then the proportion of males and of females at each of those levels was selected, using a table of random numbers,[1] that was necessary to make up a total of 331 students for the Experimental Group. A similar procedure was then employed to select some 770 students to constitute a Control Group pool from which UNI was later to select students to match with individuals in the Experimental Group. (By the time two years had gone by, only 79 matched pairs of students had completed the smaller experiment by having written all four themes and answered a brief questionnaire.)

That July, letters were written to the students in each group apprising them of the experiment and their role in it. (Copies of these and other letters mentioned below are included in Appendix A.) On each letter was typed the room and building where the student was to report to take the tests in September. Care was taken to assign equal proportions of Experimental and Control students to each of the testing rooms in an attempt to equalize among the Experimental and Control students any distracting elements or other matters associated with particular testing situations which might tend to bias the results. The same practice was followed in assigning students to rooms for all of the later tests.

As can be seen from the letters included in Appendix A, a careful attempt was made to equalize the motivation of students in the Experimental and Control groups. This was done by insisting that each student take the test but that no student's status would be affected by the outcome of the test. At the time, this seemed to be the only fair and practical way of equalizing motivation--removing all motivation! It did not seem right to have students in the Control Group take the experiment exams for their final departmental exams in the Rhetoric Program; these students might all apply themselves with such diligence that they would surpass the Experimental Group largely for that reason. It had not seemed fair, either, to have the students in the Experimental Group take those exams as departmental final exams after having been excused from the Rhetoric requirement for two years; if they did poorly and had to enroll for Rhetoric after the midpoint in their undergraduate careers, it might be quite difficult for many of them to schedule the freshman course as juniors or seniors.

---

[1] Table XXIII in Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Statistical Inference (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1953), pp. 484-485.

One must not forget the varied feelings that the participants in such an experiment must have. One letter from a student who resented taking the examinations in May, 1966, is enclosed at the end of Appendix A. Although this is the only such letter received, a number of other students revealed much the same feelings in telephone calls or personal conversations. That is one reason why, when a reminder about the last test was mailed on May 20, 1966, the students were invited to have coffee and doughnuts before beginning the last test. That is also why a questionnaire about their own attitudes toward Rhetoric was administered to them during the last testing period. (See Appendix B.)

While reading this report, one must remember that this smaller study was imbedded in the larger one directed by UNI. Although the students' attitudes may well have been affected by the fact that they wrote a theme and took two objective tests on each of four different occasions, this smaller study concerns only the themes (herein after labeled "UNI themes") planned for the first and fourth semesters in the regular experiment and the additional themes (herein after referred to as "U of I themes") not planned as part of the regular experiment, but also offered on the first and fourth testing occasions. The schedule follows for the four themes which form the basis of this smaller study:

Theme #1	(U of I)	Sept. 15, 1964	8-10 a.m.
Theme #2	(UNI)	Sept. 17, 1964	7-9 p.m.
Theme #3	(U of I)	May 25, 1966	7-9 p.m.
Theme #4	(UNI)	June 3, 1966	7:30-9:30 a.m.

The student attitude questionnaire referred to in the previous paragraph was given just before the students wrote Theme #3.

Examination of the instructions for the four themes reveals several differences between the UNI and the U of I instructions. (See Appendix C.) Whereas the UNI assignments attempt to put all students on the same footing insofar as the topic is concerned by assigning the same topic, the U of I instructions assume that an important part of writing is the selection of a topic appropriate for the writer and reader, and the consequent focus of that topic so that it can be treated adequately in the time available. Whereas the UNI assignments attempt to help the student get started by offering him some basic discussion of the topic, the U of I instructions omitted such stimulus material on the assumption that the student should provide his own and not be directed toward some approach which might tend to minimize differences among the student writers. A third difference between the two types of theme assignments stemmed from the fact that the UNI assignments were concerned only with differences between the Experimental Group and Control Group on any one testing occasion, while the U of I assignments were also designed to permit comparison of the pretest and posttest writing. This difference may not be important inasmuch as the UNI pretest and posttest assignments were very close in nature.

The analytical method used by the U of I raters to evaluate the papers is explained in detail on those pages after the first in Appendix D. The same criteria had been used for some years as the basis for evaluating departmental writing examinations in the Rhetoric Program and as a basis for instruction of students. Under this system separate judgments are made on the quality of each of five aspects of the paper: Central Idea and Analysis, Supporting Material, Organization, Expression, and Literacy. Each category is rated from one to five (F to A) except Literacy, which is rated from one to three (F to C) on the theory that no paper should be elevated to an above-average position merely because of the absence of literacy errors. To arrive at a total score for a paper, one adds the separate scores given the five categories. Thus, when one instructor is rating a paper, the theoretical range of possible total scores is from five to 23. (In the rating for the experiment, however, the total scores of two raters were added together, making a theoretical range of from ten to 46. Because the ETS raters in the larger experiment used a scale of from one to 9 and similarly added the ratings of two judges, the theoretical range of total scores under that system was from two to 18.)

Selection of Raters

All of the raters were graduate students at the University of Iowa who had been teaching at least one year in the Rhetoric Program and who seemed to have demonstrated their reliability in judging themes. The experience of each of the raters is summarized in Appendix E.

At the beginning of each academic year and toward the end of each semester, the faculty of the Rhetoric Program have meetings designed to develop consistency in theme grading. Each instructor brings to the meeting his copies of two dittoed themes which he has rated beforehand. The Coordinator of the Program discusses his own ratings of those two themes, then distributes copies of a third theme which the instructors rate independently and submit to the Coordinator before they leave. The ratings of these third themes at the January 6 and May 9, 1966, meetings provided the basis for selecting raters for the experiment.

At the January meeting, 106 instructors submitted rated themes. At the May meeting (at the end of the spring semester, when fewer classes are taught), 80 instructors submitted themes. Of these numbers, 73 graduate assistants who submitted themes on both occasions constituted the pool from whom the most reliable raters were selected in the following manner.

First the total scores were tallied for all of the faculty present at each meeting, as is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Distribution of Faculty Total Score Ratings

Total Score	January	May
22	0	0
21	1	0
20	1	3
19	2	2
18	9	0
17	9	6
16	5	6
15	12	6
14	6	10
13	24	15
12	17	15
11	12	10
10	2	3
9	5	2
8	1	1
7	0	1
6	0	0
Total	106	80

The median score for each theme was 13. (The reader should note that such range in ratings is not uncommon throughout the nation. When the Rhetoric Program conducts its departmental final theme examinations, each theme is read by two raters who have been paired to balance tendencies toward severity and leniency.)

It is often said that many of the new Rhetoric faculty tend to grade more severely in practice rating meetings than they do ordinarily. Consequently, it seemed appropriate also to compute the mean score of the five "regular" members of the Rhetoric faculty who had been teaching in the Program more than one year.

	January	May
J. Bowers	14	13
R. Braddock	13	15
L. Kelly	17	16
C. Martin	18	14
R. Wachal	15	12
Mean Score	15.4	14.0

Using the median scores of the total groups and the mean scores of the regular faculty as ranges, the following ranges in scores for each theme were determined as a basis for an initial screening of raters.

	January	May
"Best raters"	13-15	13-14
"Next best"	12-16	12-15

The ratings were next examined of graduate assistants whose total scores fell in the above groups. Their scores on each of the five rating categories were compared to the tabulations of the Rhetoric faculty as a whole, which are given in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Distribution of Faculty Category Ratings

Category	Score	January Number	May Number
Central Idea and Analysis	5	3	0
	4	18	9
	3	38	23
	2	42	31
	1	5	17
Supporting Material	5	0	7
	4	13	27
	3	28	29
	2	50	16
	1	15	1
Organization	5	2	0
	4	26	8
	3	55	21
	2	24	46
	1	1	5
Expression	5	1	1
	4	19	18
	3	57	29
	2	26	26
	1	3	6
Literacy	3	74	56
	2	31	24
	1	1	0

It seemed best to make the final selection of raters on the basis of the proximity of their scores on each category to the scores of the faculty as a whole. Consequently, the modal and the next to the modal ratings of the faculty on each category were selected as the limits for selection of raters. If the next to the modal and the second from the modal ratings were close (no further apart than 5 per cent of the total number of instructors rating that theme), then all three scores were included in the limits for selection of raters. These limits were as follows:

Category	Limits for January theme	Limits for May theme
Central Idea and Analysis	2 - 3	2 - 3
Supporting Material	2 - 3	3 - 4
Organization	2 - 4	2 - 3
Expression	2 - 3	2 - 3
Literacy	2 - 3	2 - 3

Seventeen of the "best raters" or "next best raters" had scores so close to the above ratings that all or all but one of the scores on the five categories of both themes were within the limits. Thirteen of the seventeen accepted the invitation to rate themes for the experiment. To obtain the desired fourteen raters, one of the "best raters" was enlisted, all of whose category scores but two (one on each theme) fell within the limits. The ratings on the two themes are given in Table 3 on the next page.

When the raters were paired, an error may have been made which may have helped reduce the reliability of the ratings. Because the raters had all been very close in their judgment of the January and May themes, the chief investigator ignored their ratings and paired them according to his amateur impression of their personal tendency toward dominance or submissiveness, factors probably important when judges reconcile their ratings. As it happened, some of the "higher" raters were paired and some of the "lower" raters were paired, as Table 4 shows.

TABLE 3

Ratings of All Categories by Each Judge

Raters	Practice Rating Sessions	Central Idea and Analysis	Supporting Material	Organization	Expression	Literacy	Total
S. Bush	Jan.	2	2	3	3	3	13
	May	2	3	2	2	3	12
E. Fox	Jan.	3	2	3	4	3	15
	May	2	3	2	3	2	12
B. Hodge	Jan.	3	2	3	4	3	15
	May	2	4	2	4	2	14
N. Holmes	Jan.	2	2	3	2	3	12
	May	2	3	3	4	3	15
D. Horne	Jan.	3	3	4	2	3	15
	May	2	4	1	3	3	13
P. Jensen	Jan.	2	2	2	3	3	12
	May	3	4	2	2	2	13
B. Johnson	Jan.	3	3	4	3	3	16
	May	1	4	2	3	3	13
M. Kelly	Jan.	2	2	3	2	3	12
	May	1	3	3	2	3	12
L. Kramer	Jan.	2	2	3	3	3	13
	May	2	4	2	2	3	13
R. Miller	Jan.	2	2	2	3	3	12
	May	2	3	2	3	3	13
E. Pixley	Jan.	3	2	3	3	2	13
	May	1	3	2	3	3	12
S. Renner	Jan.	3	2	3	2	2	12
	May	2	4	3	3	3	15
G. Stewart	Jan.	2	2	3	4	3	14
	May	3	4	3	2	3	15
E. Weihe	Jan.	3	2	3	4	3	15
	May	3	3	3	3	3	15

TABLE 4

Comparison of Total Scores of Pairs of Judges

	Total Scores on Themes			
Pair of Raters	Jan.	May	Sums of Totals	Total for Pair
S. Bush	13	12	25	
M. Kelly	12	12	24	49
E. Fox	15	12	27	
B. Johnson	16	13	29	56
B. Hodge	15	14	29	
D. Horne	15	13	28	57
N. Holmes	12	15	27	
S. Renner	12	15	27	54
P. Jensen	12	13	25	
R. Miller	12	13	25	50
E. Pixley	13	12	25	
L. Kramer	13	13	26	51
G. Stewart	14	15	29	
E. Weihe	15	15	30	59

Theme Rating

When the last themes had been written, all eight themes for each matched pair of students were brought together. Then both themes written by a matched pair of students on the same occasion were assigned to the same pair of raters for grading during the same rating period. For example, the theme written by the experimental student on June 3, 1966, and the theme written by his matched control student on the same day, were rated by the same pair of raters during the same rating period. This was done, of course, to minimize differences attributable to severity and leniency and to freshness and fatigue of raters. In addition, each pair of themes written by matched students on one occasion was assigned to a different pair of raters than any themes written by the same students on another occasion. Thus, the themes written by a matched pair of students on May 25, 1966, were graded by a different pair of raters than the themes written by the same students on June 3, 1966. The themes the same pair of students wrote on September 15, 1964, were graded by a third pair of raters, and so on. This was done to prevent the raters from recognizing the handwriting and style of a student and hence from guessing--in the case of the Rhetoric-designed themes--whether the theme was written in the fall of 1964 or the spring of 1966.

Once the themes had been distributed according to raters, the sheet which explained the assignment and included the student's name and the testing date was removed from each theme. The only means of identification now left on the theme was the student's identification number and, in many cases, a booklet number. It was impossible to tell from the student numbers whether the student was in the experimental or control group. It was also highly unlikely that the raters could tell from the booklet numbers--which were scattered over a range of several hundred numbers--whether the small experiment themes were written in September, 1964, or May, 1966.

Because the assignment for the September, 1964, large experiment theme (Theme #2) was different from the assignment for the June, 1966, large experiment theme (Theme #4), the raters may have been able to guess which was the pretest theme and which the posttest theme. Even though the paper used for both the pretest and posttest themes for the large experiment was all purchased at the same time and stored in approximately the same manner, the pretest theme paper became slightly darker in color and could have been distinguished from the posttest theme paper if the raters had sought differences. But it was impossible for the raters to determine which of these themes were written by students in the experimental group, which by students in the control group.

The small experiment theme assignments were designed to measure improvement. That is, the topics for the September, 1964, and the May, 1966, small experiment themes (Themes #1 and #3) were the same, and the students were instructed not to reveal the time at which they were writing. (See Appendix C.) The raters were instructed to turn in any themes if they could tell when they were written. (See "Instructions to Raters," Appendix B.) Five such themes were turned in. All themes of those five students were thereupon withdrawn from consideration in the U of I experiment.

The rating extended from the morning of Wednesday, June 8, 1966, to shortly after noon on Saturday, June 11, following this schedule:

8:30-10 a.m.	Rating	1-2:30 p.m.	Rating
10-10:30 a.m.	Coffee Break	2:30-3 p.m.	Coffee Break
10:30-noon	Rating	3-4:30 p.m.	Rating
noon-1 p.m.	Lunch Break		

The first period on the first day was spent explaining the nature of the experiment, going over the "Instructions to Raters" (Appendix D), and discussing and rating two duplicated themes. These and the pairs of themes used for discussion on Thursday and Friday mornings were Theme #1 and Theme #2 papers written by students who had dropped out of the experiment. Half an hour or more at the beginning of each of the three mornings was spent discussing and rating the sample themes. (A similar discussion might well have been held each afternoon, too.) Otherwise, the chief investigator (who chaired the rating sessions) kept aloof from the rating except to distribute and collect papers, answer an occasional question about procedure, and see that the group observed the time schedule. (Some raters would have worked through the breaks but were not permitted to do so.)

All of the rating sessions met in the same place, Michigan Room on the third floor of the Iowa Memorial Union. The room was air-conditioned and equipped with more long tables than the raters could use. It was removed from active, distracting areas of the Union, yet within a few minutes of the first floor and basement cafeterias for coffee and lunch breaks.

The raters were paid $4 an hour ($28 per day) for their services and seemed pleased. Rating six hours per day for three and a half days, the 14 raters read 672 themes (each of the themes twice, 97 of them four times, five of those six times) at a rate of some five and a quarter themes per rater per hour, but that time included not only individual silent rating but conferences between judges and daily discussion of the same themes by the entire group.

After the first few rating periods, one-fourth of all the themes which had been rated were placed at regular intervals among the themes which were still to be rated. The purpose of this was to compare the ratings of different pairs of raters on the same themes and thus to obtain an indication of the reliability of the rating. In each case, a pair of themes written by the same matched pair of students on the same occasion was moved together into a new packet of themes being scored by a pair of raters other than those who had previously judged the pair of papers. Unfortunately, accomplishing this had not been planned adequately beforehand, and an even sampling of the four themes was not obtained. The reratings occurred as follows:

Theme	N Rerated Once	N Rerated Twice	Total Reratings
1 (U of I)	6	0	6
2 (UNI)	38	1	40
3 (U of I)	25	0	25
4 (UNI)	28	4	36
Total Reratings	97	5	107

Though an even distribution of reratings among the four themes was not obtained, the identity of the writers and the results of any first ratings were successfully hidden from all raters. The raters were sometimes conscious of the fact that themes had already been rated, but they could not tell who had rated them before or what the previous ratings had been. If they themselves had rated the papers before, they returned them without rating them a second time. When all of the rating was completed, each rater filled out a blank answering these questions:

1. Except for any themes which you turned in to be disregarded in the experiment for this reason, were you able to tell whether any theme was written by an experimental or a control group student?

2. Did you notice any differences between the U of I theme booklets written in September, 1964, and those written in May, 1966? What differences did you detect?

3. What percentage of the papers you read would you estimate were dashed off with little or no attempt to be well written?

All 14 raters answered "No" to each of the first two questions. Their answers to the third question varied as follows:

31-40%	4
21-30%	3
11-20%	2
1-10%	3
"Some"	1
"Can't tell"	1

Though they were not asked anything of this nature, four of the raters added notes on their questionnaires, volunteering the opinion that there were more "dashed off" papers among those written on the "Non-conformity" and "Unconventional" topics (the UNI topics) than on the U of I topics, from which students had a choice.

III

FINDINGS[1]

This experiment sought to supplement a larger experiment, directed at the University of Northern Iowa, by seeking answers to these questions:

1. At the college freshman-sophomore level of writing, which is a more reliable method of rating papers--the U of I "analytical" method or the ETS "general impression" method?

2. At the college freshman-sophomore level, can a more significant measure of quality of writing be obtained when the criterion used is the better of two papers, rather than merely one paper?

3. Has the writing performance of students who have taken Rhetoric at the University of Iowa improved significantly more than that of matched students who have been excused from the course?

Analytical versus Impression Rating

In the larger UNI experiment, two ETS raters judged each of the regular themes independently and recorded their scores without consulting each other.[2] A rating reliability was computed from these pairs of scores, using the Pearson product-moment formula. With the U of I ratings, a different procedure had to be used because each pair of raters consulted about its ratings and reconciled them within certain limits. (See "Instructions to Raters," Appendix D.) In the U of I experiment, approximately one-seventh of the themes already rated were mixed in with the other themes and rated again by other pairs of raters. In no case did the second pair of raters have any knowledge of the ratings assigned by the first pair. An analysis of the reliability of the rating between pairs of raters was made, using the Pearson product-moment forumula. The resulting reliabilities for the U of I and ETS raters are given in Table 5, an examination of which yields the following findings:

1. The rating of Central Idea and Analysis by the U of I raters was less reliable on the UNI themes than on the U of I themes. This difference may be attributed to

---

[1] Acknowledgment is due Gordon White (University of Iowa) for writing the computer program and assembling its analyses.

[2] Professor Jewell and his colleagues helpfully supplied the ETS ratings for both themes.

TABLE 5

Reliability of U of I and ETS Ratings
Determined by the Pearson Product-Moment Formula

	Central Idea and Analysis	Supporting Material	Organization	Expression	Literacy	Total Score (U of I Ratings)	General Score (ETS Ratings)
Theme 1 (U of I Pretest	.48	-.26	-.23	.33	.64	-.04	---
Theme 2 (UNI Pretest)	-.15	.15	.14	-.10	.74	.05	.25
Theme 3 (U of I Posttest)	.40	.24	.30	.42	.24	.29	---
Theme 4 (UNI Posttest)	.13	.41	.34	-.04	.80	.34	.60
Themes 1+3	.44	.19	.17	.39	.36	.30	---
Themes 2+4	.09	.35	.30	-.07	.76	.27	.46
Themes 1+2+3+4	.22	.35	.27	.02	.63	.28	---

the wording of the theme topics. The UNI topics may partly have focused the student's central idea for him, establishing such a common approach from one student to the next that the raters had difficulty discriminating differences from one paper to another. The U of I topics were broadly phrased so that the student would have to focus his central idea more or less deliberately or sharply, producing more differences to discriminate. With the U of I topics, the student may also have had more opportunity to write on something interesting to him and, partly because of that and partly because of the diversity of topics from which the students could choose, the raters may have tended to find the results more or less original, hence easier to discriminate among. (Because of the type of analysis used, the variances which could be examined to support or refute this hypothesis were not printed out while the reliability computations were being made.)

2. Supporting Material was rated less reliably on the U of I papers than on the UNI themes. The difference seems unaccountable, especially when the suggestion of some specific details in the explanation of the UNI topics may have tended to reduce the differences among the UNI themes in this category. On the other hand, perhaps the fact that all the UNI themes were on the same topics permitted the raters to concentrate on Supporting Material and to notice differences which, on the U of I papers, were partly obscured by differences in topic.

3. Organization was rated less reliably on the U of I than on the UNI themes. Again, the assignment of a single topic on each UNI theme may have helped the raters distinguish differences in quality of a factor like Organization.

4. The Expression category was rated less reliably on the UNI themes than on the U of I papers. No explanation is yet apparent, unless giving the student a choice among different topics afforded him more opportunity to exploit his own expressive powers and hence permitted students to achieve a range which the raters could discriminate better.

5. Literacy was rated more reliably than any other category. Except for Theme 3, the low figure for which seems unaccountable, the reliabilities ranged from .64 to .80 in this category. This satisfactory reliability is especially noteworthy in the face of the fact that Literacy was rated from 1 to but 3, the other four categories being rated from 1 to 5. Undoubtedly the reliability may be attributed to the point-scoring under Literacy used in the U of I system and the more

readily apparent correctness and incorrectness of items under Literacy than of items under Expression, in which point-scoring is also used. (See Appendix D.)

6. The Total Scores of the pretest themes were reached less reliably than the Total Scores of the posttest themes. Differences between the U of I and UNI theme topics probably account for some of the observations made above, and the relative definiteness with which Literacy may be rated explains why the reliability of its rating surpasses that of the other categories. But these differences cancel out each other in a comparison of the reliabilities of the ratings of the two pretest themes to the reliabilities of the two posttest themes. The fact that all four themes were rated at the same time under the same conditions further obscures an explanation. --In any case, the ratings of the pretest themes were so unreliable as to make the experiment absolutely worthless as a measurement of improvement or lack of improvement.

7. To compare the reliability of the ETS raters most carefully to the U of I raters, one must compare their ratings on Themes 2 and 4, the only papers which both groups of raters judged. The reliability of the U of I ratings on both themes taken together was .27, compared to .46 for the ETS ratings. Each of these figures evidently was reduced by the low reliability of ratings on Theme 2 (the pretest theme)--.05 for the U of I raters, .25 for the ETS raters. Even on Theme 4, however, the U of I ratings were no better than .34 and the ETS ratings .60. It is only this last figure which approaches a reliability lending any weight to the ratings.

Better of Two Papers versus One Paper

One of the major reasons for conducting this small study to supplement the larger UNI-directed experiment stemmed from the fear that use of only one criterion theme as a posttest would not yield significant differences. The rationale is that better writers vary more in their day-to-day performance than worse writers and hence that some improvement in writing is necessarily obscured by day-to-day variation unless writers have several opportunities to demonstrate their improvement. Consequently, several analyses were undertaken to determine whether or not significant differences could be detected using the better of two posttest theme scores or the sum of the two posttest theme scores (when the UNI design called for only one posttest theme at this time--June, a year after the conclusion of instruction).

Using Lindquist's Type I design[3] and employing the ANOVA computer program, three tests were made of each analysis undertaken:

> 1. Were there significant differences between the mean theme scores of the experimental and control groups?
>
> 2. Were there significant differences in mean theme scores between levels of ability?
>
> 3. Were there significant interactions of treatment with ability? That is, were there differences between the experimental and control groups at one level even if not at other levels?

Levels of ability were established by assigning each student to one of three levels according to the sum of the two socres awarded him by the ETS raters on Theme #2:

Scores	Levels	No. of Pairs of Students
13 - 18	L_3	5
8 - 12	L_2	60
2 - 7	L_1	14

Analyses were conducted of each of the five categories on the U of I theme rating system, of the Total Score, and of the sum of the scores on the first three categories. Although all of the findings are given in the tables in Appendix F, the major findings are noted here when they are significant at or below the .10 level. The reader should be warned, however, that when the rating reliability was low, it cannot be concluded that the lack of significant differences has any significance.

> 1. When the student's better score on Theme 3 or 4 is the criterion, no significant differences (other than differences by level only) are noted except on the Organization category, where the top level of the Control Group surpassed the top level of the Experimental Group and the bottom level of the Experimental Group surpassed the bottom level of the Control Group. The amount of difference was small, even though statistically significant.

---

[3] E. F. Lindquist, Design and Analysis of Experiments (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1953), pp. 267-273.

2. When the sum of the student's two scores on Themes 3 and 4 is the criterion, no significant differences are noted (other than differences by level only).

3. When the student's gains are computed between the better of Theme 1 and 2 and the better of Theme 3 and 4, the only significant difference is in Organization, where a direction is seen which is the reverse of that in Finding 1 immediately above. With gain scores between better efforts, the top level of the Experimental Group surpassed the top level of the Control Group, and the bottom level of the Control Group outperformed the bottom level of the Experimental Group. Again, however, the differences, while significant, were too small to have practical importance.

4. When gains are computed on but one pretest and one posttest (Themes 1 and 3), only one significant difference is noted, and that is in Expression, favoring the Experimental Group over the Control Group by an amount too small to make any practical difference.

Rhetoric Students versus Excused Students

It has already been noted above that there were very few statistically significant differences observed between the Experimental and Control Groups and that those differences were small and of no practical significance. The absence of observed differences in the writing may have come from a failure of the Rhetoric course to have an effect or from the failure of the rating to observe an effect which did exist.

In addition to observable differences in the writing itself, differences were sought in the attitudes of the students. At the May 25, 1966, testing session, the students answered the questionnaire shown in Appendix B. The results are indicated here in Tables 6 and 7. The first question (Table 6) was an attempt to determine, unfortunately after the fact, how equivalent were the initial attitudes of the Experimental and Control students. They seemed roughly equivalent, though there was a tendency for the bottom level of the Control Group to appraise its preparation lower than the bottom level of the Experimental Group appraised its preparation. Doubtless the Control students, having had Rhetoric, had developed a clearer picture of their writing deficiencies than the Experimental students had been able to develop.

The second question (Table 7) constituted an attempt to determine the students' inclination to elect Rhetoric if it were not required, and hence to derive some impression of whether or not the students thought the course was helping them improve their writing. If both the Experimental and Control Groups had strongly tended to select answers from 4-6, their positive feelings about the required freshman course would have been unquestioned. That was not the case. Only one-fourth of the Experimental students indicated answers from 4-6, and the heaviest preference (almost half of all the Experimental students) came for an upperclassman elective in writing to replace the freshman Rhetoric requirement.[4] The responses of the Control students were somewhat different. Almost half of them gave responses to answers 4-6, indicating a much stronger endorsement of the course from these students who had had it. Did this stronger endorsement stem from a recognition of the value of the Rhetoric course or from a sense of security in what the students had already experienced? The answer seems purely speculative. But one piece of speculation may go unchallenged by anyone interested in the quality of writing at the University of Iowa: when 58 per cent of all the Experimental and Control students state after two years on campus that they originally entered the University "fully" or "rather well" prepared to do the writing they had to do in courses other than Rhetoric, it is apparent that these other courses do not demand precise, incisive writing.

---

[4] The Experimental students here reject an upperclassman course in writing and speaking for one in writing alone. Yet it has been demonstrated that the Rhetoric course instruction in speech has a statistically significant effect. See Appendix G, "Effectiveness of Speech Instruction in the Rhetoric Program."

TABLE 6

Student Appraisal of Preparation for Writing in Courses Other than Rhetoric

See Appendix B for the full questionnaire of which this is a part. Responses are indicated in percentages. L_3 indicates the top group (N=5), L_2 the middle group (N=60), and L_1 the bottom group (N=14).

1. When you came to the U of I your first September, how well prepared were you to do the kinds of writing you have since done in courses other than Rhetoric? (Check only one response.)	Experimental			Control		
	L_3	L_2	L_1	L_3	L_2	L_1
1. Fully prepared. The composition instruction in Rhetoric was not necessary for me.	20.0	1.7	7.1	20.0	13.3	0.0
2. Rather well prepared. Although Rhetoric might have helped me improve my writing some, I did not need to take Rhetoric to do adequate writing for my other freshman and sophomore courses.	60.0	65.0	71.4	40.0	38.3	21.4
3. Rather weakly prepared. Although my writing was not bad enough to have lowered my grades in other freshman and sophomore courses without having taken Rhetoric, I would not want to leave my writing at that level.	20.0	20.0	7.1	20.0	31.7	57.1
4. Quite weakly prepared. My writing in other freshman and sophomore courses (a) would have been weak enough to lower some of my grades if I had not had Rhetoric OR (b) was weak enough that it did lower some of my grades because I did not have Rhetoric.	0.0	8.3	7.1	0.0	15.0	21.4
5. The question does not pertain to me. (If you check 5, also check either a or b or both below.)						
a. I have done no or almost no writing (term papers, essay tests, etc.) for other freshman and sophomore courses.	0.0	1.7	7.1	0.0	1.7	0.0
b. Although my writing needed improvement, (a) Rhetoric did not help it improve OR (b) I did not take Rhetoric, but it would not have helped my writing improve.	0.0	1.7	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Response omitted	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mean response	2.0	2.4	2.4	2.0	2.5	3.0

TABLE 7

Student Inclination to Elect Rhetoric

See Appendix B for the full questionnaire of which this is a part. Responses are indicated in percentages. L_3 indicates the top group (N=5), L_2 the middle group (N=60), and L_1 the bottom group (N=14).

2. Knowing what you know now, if you were an entering freshman at U of I and Rhetoric was an elective, not a required subject, which of the following would you do? (Check only one response.)	Experimental			Control		
	L_3	L_2	L_1	L_3	L_2	L_1
1. Not take Rhetoric or any other freshman or upperclass college course offering instruction in expository and argumentative writing.	20.0	18.3	7.1	20.0	26.7	14.3
2. Not take Rhetoric as a freshman, but plan to elect, as an upperclassman, a two-hour course in expository and argumentative writing.	80.0	38.3	71.4	20.0	18.3	14.3
3. Not take Rhetoric as a freshman, but plan to elect, as an upperclassman, a four-hour Rhetoric course (expository and argumentative speaking and writing.)	0.0	15.0	7.1	0.0	18.3	0.0
4. Take Rhetoric as a freshman unless, as under the system now extended to all freshmen who do well on the ACT tests, I was able during Registration Week to write a theme and deliver a speech which met the Rhetoric Program standards for exemption.	0.0	18.3	7.1	40.0	23.3	64.3
5. Take Rhetoric as a freshman even though I could exempt myself at the outset by examination.	0.0	3.3	7.1	20.0	13.3	7.1
6. Take Rhetoric as a freshman in any event and plan to take, as an upperclassman, an additional two-hour course in expository and argumentative writing.	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Response omitted	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mean response	1.8	2.6	2.4	3.2	2.8	3.4

IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Cooperative Research Program of the U. S. Office of Education invested $4,279 in this project. Unfortunately, the answers sought by the project were not obtained. The results of the experiment were inconclusive, most importantly, because the rating of the papers was not reliable. Several explanations for the unreliability seem apparent:

1. The two themes used as a basis for selecting raters were both "C" papers. In addition to "C" papers, clear examples of "A" and "F" papers should have been used. It may be that the fourteen raters tended to keep their ratings near a "safe" average range and hence not to discriminate differences among papers. (Because of the type of analysis used, the variances which could be examined to support or refute this hypothesis were not printed out while the reliability computations were being made.)

2. The rereading of papers to determine rating reliability should have been more carefully planned. Specifically, a larger proportion of the papers should have been reread. (Note that the reliability of the ETS ratings was computed on the double rating of all papers.) Certainly the sampling of papers to be reread should have been carefully selected, not chosen haphazardly and hence been unrepresentative.

3. When two or more pretest or two or more posttest themes are used (to yield either a best score or a total score), probably the same type of assignment should be employed for each theme.

4. More time should have been devoted during the rating period to the rating and discussion of themes carefully selected to exemplify certain kinds of problems. This practice should have been used more extensively to build consensus among the raters but, in addition, it should have been used as a continual check against the reliability of the raters. If some raters were found to be "wild" or "too safe" on several such commonly graded themes, those raters should have been discharged from rating any additional papers.

5. It has been suggested to the authors of this report that it might have been better to use a rating scale ranging more widely than the scale normally used for instructional purposes. The argument for increasing the range is that it will make reliability

more possible by forcing the raters to make larger discriminations among papers. The argument against extending the range is that it may tend to reveal small amounts of differences which, in the practical world, are of little consequence. Note that the ratings under the U of I system were less reliable than they were under the ETS system, even though the range on the U of I scale (5-23) is twice as great as it is on the ETS scale (1-9). Note further that the best reliabilities shown on Table 5 were for Literacy, which was graded on a 3-point scale in contrast to the 5-point scale used for the other categories.

6. One explanation for the low reliability of the rating may have been that the differences among the papers were in fact very small. If that were true, it could be attributed to the ineffectiveness of requiring freshman composition. Perhaps by the college freshman year, writing habits are so established that instruction can affect them but little. Or perhaps instruction did have a significant effect which was lost a year or more later when the posttest was administered, because the students had had inadequate challenge or opportunity to maintain the proficiency they had developed. In this experiment, however, two other conditions may have helped to produce small differences among papers:

a. A mistake was made in removing all practical motivation for the students to write well. Some means should have been developed for motivating all of the students and motivating the Experimental and Control students equally. Suggestions for accomplishing this would be gratefully received by the authors of this report.

b. Evidently in contrast to some of the other universities cooperating in the UNI experiment, the U of I emphasizes argumentative writing to a considerable extent. This is probably the most distinctive emphasis of the U of I program in contrast to the high school composition programs from which its freshmen come. Consequently, the smaller U of I study erred in using expository assignments merely because the larger UNI experiment did. If the U of I freshmen had in fact written much less argument than exposition in high

> school, then the U of I instruction in argument should make much more difference in their writing argument than it would in writing exposition. Probably the smaller U of I experiment (and perhaps the larger UNI study also) was testing the wrong thing.

Although the Cooperative Research Program grant did not obtain the answers which the study sought, it may well have taught the investigators (and readers of this report) how to conduct a similar study in a much more valuable way. Such a modified replication is recommended with the changes above. Two other suggestions are made as a part of this recommendation:

1. Certain modifications are currently being made in the course of study of the Rhetoric Program and in the advisory system it maintains for its graduate assistants. These changes should be completed and working satisfactorily before another experiment of this type is undertaken. One should test the effectiveness of the best he can do.

2. Probably the real alternative to the freshman Rhetoric requirement is not the complete absence of any instruction in writing, public speaking, or reading. Although a new experiment should still have a group of students excused from everything, two other experimental groups should be used to represent practical alternatives to the existing requirement:

    a. A group from the total experimental group which elects to take writing or Rhetoric at the junior level instead of the freshman level.

    b. A group from the experimental group which takes public speaking but no instruction in writing except as individuals who periodically report to the Writing Laboratory to review on an individual basis papers they have written for other courses or at their own individual initiative.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTERS TO STUDENTS
---AND ONE RESPONSE

STATE
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

College of Liberal Arts
Office of the Dean

July 20, 1964

Dear Student:

In cooperation with four other colleges and universities and with the strong support of the U.S. Office of Education, the University of Iowa is conducting an experiment to test the effectiveness of college instruction in freshman composition. To conduct this experiment, we must compare the performance of students who take Rhetoric with those who do not. You have been selected as a member of the group of 331 students at SUI who will not be required to take Rhetoric. I hope that you will cooperate to make this important research meaningful.

Your cooperation in the following matters is essential to the success of the experiment:

1. When you register at the Field House this September, register for the Rhetoric course numbered 10:6, a course existing on paper only and bearing no credit hours. By registering for 10:6 you inform us that you are cooperating with the experiment and are not taking *a Rhetoric course.* If you register for 10:6 each semester during the academic years 1964-65 and 1965-66 (a total of four semesters), if you take no other composition courses during this period, and if you take the examinations described below, you will be excused from the Rhetoric requirement.

2. Report at the following times to take the examinations, bringing a ball-point or fountain pen with which to write. These examinations take precedence over all other events.

Theme:	Tue., Sept. 15, 8:00-10:00 a.m.	For each of these tests you are to report to:
Objective Tests:	Wed., Sept. 16, 3:30-5:30 p.m.	
Theme:	Thu., Sept. 17, 7:00-9:00 p.m.	

You will be asked to report again in January, 1965, and in June, 1965, to take alternate forms of the objective tests and of one of the theme examinations. Then you will be asked to report in June, 1966, to take all three examinations again as you will have done this September. If you enroll for 10:6 and take these examinations, you will be permitted to graduate without taking Rhetoric. Although your graduation from college will be in no way dependent on how well you do on them, we expect you to do your best work on the examinations. If you do not take the examinations, however, you will be required to enroll in the appropriate Rhetoric course at your first opportunity.

Most students being excused from Rhetoric probably will wish to register for one of the Literature Core courses instead, though you may, if you wish, confer with your adviser about taking another course. If you have any questions about the experiment now or after you enter the University, please write or see Professor Richard Braddock, Coordinator, Rhetoric Program, Old Armory Temporary Building.

So that we will know you have received this letter and understand it, please sign the enclosed post card and return it before July 31.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Braddock
Richard Braddock
Coordinator, Rhetoric Program

Dewey B. Stuit

Dewey B. Stuit
Dean

Special Note for "10:3 or 10:6" Students

If "10:3 or 10:6" is indicated on your Final Admission Statement, you would normally be eligible to attempt to test out of Rhetoric. Your initial participation in the experiment will not deny you this privilege. When you write the Tuesday theme for the experiment, tell your proctor you wish the theme to count for the 10:3 theme test as well as for the experiment. Then you need not take the regular 10:3 theme test at 10 a.m. that morning. You will, however, still need to take the other examinations for the experiment and the 10:3 speech test scheduled on page 39 of the Handbook for New University Students. If you achieve high enough scores on both 10:3 examinations, you will be exempt from the Rhetoric requirement and from further cooperation with the experiment. You may find out whether or not you achieved high enough scores by inquiring at the Rhetoric Office on Tuesday, September 22.

STATE
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

College of Liberal Arts
Office of the Dean

July 31, 1964

Dear Student:

In cooperation with four other colleges and universities and with the strong support of the U.S. Office of Education, the University of Iowa is conducting an experiment to test the effectiveness of college instruction in freshman composition. To conduct this experiment, we must compare the performance of students who take Rhetoric with those who do not. You have been selected as a member of the group of some 750 students who will take Rhetoric as usual but who will also take a series of examinations which will permit comparison of their writing performance to the performance of students not taking Rhetoric. Your group is designated as "the control group."

Your cooperation will involve taking some special examinations during the course of the two-year experiment. Please report at the following times to take the initial examinations, bringing a ball-point or fountain pen with which to write. These examinations take precedence over all other events.

Theme:	Tue., Sept. 15, 8:00-10:00 a.m.	For each of these tests you are to report to:
Objective Tests:	Wed., Sept. 16, 3:30-5:30 p.m.	
Theme:	Thu., Sept. 17, 7:00-9:00 p.m.	

By Christmas, 1964, you will be notified whether or not you are to continue being a member of the control group. If you are to continue, you will be asked to report again in January, 1965, and in June, 1965, to take alternate forms of the objective tests and of one of the theme examinations. Then you will be asked to report in June, 1966, to take all three examinations again as you will have done this September. Although the results will not be used in determining your Rhetoric grade, we must insist that you take the examinations as part of your regular Rhetoric requirement and we expect you to do your best work on them.

We are confident that you will be pleased to be one of the thousands of students in the five universities cooperating to make this experiment yield significant information. If you have any question about your part, please feel free to write to Professor Richard Braddock, Coordinator, Rhetoric Program, Old Armory Temporary Building.

So that we will know you have received this letter and understand it, please sign the enclosed post card and return it before August 15.

Yours sincerely,
Richard Braddock
Richard Braddock
Coordinator, Rhetoric Program

Dewey B. Stuit
Dewey B. Stuit
Dean

Special Note for 10:3 Students

If your Final Admission Statement indicates that you should take the Rhetoric course numbered 10:3, you are eligible to attempt to test out of Rhetoric. Your initial participation in the experiment will not deny you this privilege. When you write the Tuesday theme for the experiment, tell your proctor you wish the theme to count for the 10:3 theme test as well as for the experiment. Then you need not take the regular 10:3 theme test at 10 a.m. that morning. You will, however, still need to take the other examinations for the experiment and the 10:3 speech test scheduled on page 39 of the Handbook for New University Students. If you achieve high enough scores on both 10:3 examinations, you will be exempt from the Rhetoric requirement and from further cooperation with the experiment. You may find out from your 10:3 instructor by Tuesday, September 22, whether or not you achieved high enough scores.

STATE
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

College of Liberal Arts
Office of the Dean

January 6, 1965

We wish to thank you for taking the examinations for the Rhetoric experiment last September. Your cooperation, along with that of the other students here at the University of Iowa and the other cooperating universities, will help insure that we obtain results which will be meaningful to higher education throughout the United States.

Although some students are being dismissed from the experiment at this time because they could not be matched with others, we have been able to match you with another student and hence are relying on you to continue in the experiment. We ask that you give the few hours each semester that it takes to participate in this important project and hope that you will do your best work in the examinations.

In order not to inconvenience you by holding the examinations at night or on a week end, we have scheduled them during examination week as shown below. As there is no preparation for the experiment exams, we hope they will not seriously interfere with your regular examinations, especially when you know about them this far ahead and can plan your studying accordingly. The examinations for the Rhetoric experiment take precedence over all other events. Please note now on your calendar the time and place of each exam so that you will be present on time.

For each of these tests you are to report to:

Theme: Mon., Jan. 25, 1:00 - 2:50 p.m.
Objective Tests: Thu., Jan. 28, 8:00 - 9:50 a.m.

Please also note that you must continue to register for 10:6 each semester (except the summer session) through spring, 1966. That way we can be sure to see that you are excused from the Rhetoric requirement. If a student in the experimental group neglects to take any of the experiment exams, he will be dismissed from the experiment and be required to fulfill the Rhetoric requirement like any other freshman.

If you have any question about your status in the experiment or in Rhetoric, please do not hesitate to telephone or see Professor Braddock or his secretary, 4A OAT, Ext. 2229 or Ext. 2069. Again, thank you for helping make the Rhetoric experiment meaningful.

N.B. Please bring a pen or ball point to the theme exam, and a #2 pencil to the objective exam.

Yours sincerely,
Richard Braddock
Richard Braddock
Coordinator, Rhetoric Program

Dewey B. Stuit
Dewey B. Stuit
Dean

STATE
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

College of Liberal Arts
Office of the Dean

January 6, 1965

We wish to thank you for taking the examinations for the Rhetoric experiment last September. Your cooperation, along with that of the other students here at the University of Iowa and the other cooperating universities, will help insure that we obtain results which will be meaningful to higher education throughout the United States.

Although some students are being dismissed from the experiment at this time because they could not be matched with others, we have been able to match you with another student and hence are relying on you to continue in the experiment. We ask that you give the few hours each semester that it takes to participate in this important project and hope that you will do your best work in the examinations.

In order not to inconvenience you by holding the examinations at night or on a week end, we have scheduled them during examination week as shown below. As there is no preparation for the experiment exams, we hope they will not seriously interfere with your regular examinations, especially when you know about them this far ahead and can plan your studying accordingly. The examinations for the Rhetoric experiment take precedence over all other events. Please note now on your calendar the time and place of each exam so that you will be present on time.

		For each of these tests you are to report to:
Theme:	Mon., Jan. 25, 1:00 - 2:50 p.m.	
Objective Tests:	Thu., Jan. 28, 8:00 - 9:50 a.m.	

To compensate you for the added writing you are doing for the experiment, your Rhetoric instructor has been asked to excuse you, if you wish to be excused, from one of his regular theme assignments in January (but not the final theme). At the same time, if a student neglects to take either experiment exam, he will receive an "Incomplete" for his final Rhetoric grade this semester.

If you have any question about your status in the experiment or in Rhetoric, please do not hesitate to telephone or see Professor Braddock or his secretary, 4A OAT, Ext. 2229 or Ext. 2069. Again, thank you for helping make the Rhetoric experiment meaningful.

N.B. Please bring a pen or ball point to the theme exam, and a #2 pencil to the objective exam.

Yours sincerely,
Richard Braddock
Richard Braddock
Coordinator, Rhetoric Program
Dewey B. Stuit
Dewey B. Stuit
Dean

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA 52240

College of Liberal Arts
Office of the Dean

May 10, 1965

We wish to thank you again for cooperating with the Rhetoric experiment. As we conclude the first year of the two-year project and information about the experiment spreads, we find many colleges and universities in the United States awaiting the outcome. Consequently, we hope that you will continue to do your best when you take the examinations this month and again a year from now.

Because more students than anticipated found it inconvenient to take the experiment exams during Examination Week this January, we have scheduled the coming exams for the weekday evenings shown below. Do remember that the examinations for the Rhetoric experiment take precedence over all other events. Please note now on your calendar the time and place of each exam so that you will be present on time.

		For each of these tests you are to report to:
Theme:	Mon., May 17, 7:00-8:50 p.m.	
Objective Tests:	Thu., May 20, 7:00-8:50 p.m.	

If a student in the experimental group neglects to take any of the experiment exams, he will be dismissed from the experiment and be required to fulfill the Rhetoric requirement like any other student. Please note that you must continue to register for 10:6 during the fall and spring semesters next year (but not this summer).

If you have any question about your status in the experiment or in Rhetoric, please do not hesitate to telephone or see Professor Braddock or his secretary, 4A OAT, Ext. 2229 or Ext. 2069. Again, thank you for helping make the Rhetoric experiment meaningful.

N. B. Please bring a pen or ball point to the theme exam and a #2 pencil to the objective tests.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Braddock

Richard Braddock
Coordinator, Rhetoric Program

Dewey B. Stuit

Dewey B. Stuit
Dean

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA 52240

College of Liberal Arts
Office of the Dean

May 10, 1965

We wish to thank you again for cooperating with the Rhetoric experiment. As we conclude the first year of the two-year project and information about the experiment spreads, we find many colleges and universities in the United States awaiting the outcome. Consequently, we hope that you will continue to do your best when you take the examinations this month and again a year from now.

Because more students than anticipated found it inconvenient to take the experiment exams during Examination Week this January, we have scheduled the coming exams for the weekday evenings shown below. Do remember that the examinations for the Rhetoric experiment take precedence over all other events. Please note now on your calendar the time and place of each exam so that you will be present on time.

Theme: Mon., May 17, 7:00-8:50 p.m.
Objective Tests: Thu., May 20, 7:00-8:50 p.m.

For each of these tests you are to report to:

To compensate you for the added writing you are doing for the experiment, we have asked your Rhetoric instructor to excuse you, if you ask him to, from the final reading examination in Rhetoric, which all other 10:2 and 10:3 students will be required to take. Please remember, though, that if a student neglects to take either experiment exam he will receive an "Incomplete" for his final Rhetoric grade and be expected to take the final reading exam with the Rhetoric students not in the experiment.

If you have any question about your status in the experiment or in Rhetoric, please do not hesitate to telephone or see Professor Braddock or his secretary, 4A OAT, Ext. 2229 or Ext. 2069. Again, thank you for helping make the Rhetoric experiment meaningful.

N. B. Please bring a pen or ball point to the theme exam and a #2 pencil to the objective tests.

Yours sincerely,
Richard Braddock
Richard Braddock
Coordinator, Rhetoric Program

Dewey B. Stuit
Dewey B. Stuit
Dean

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA 52240

College of Liberal Arts
Office of the Dean

May 5, 1966

Dear Student:

Thanks to your cooperation, the Rhetoric experiment is nearing completion. This summer the five cooperating colleges and universities will be analyzing the results for a report in the fall. We look forward to informing you of the general results and of your own personal scores.

You may recall that we began at the U of I with 331 matched pairs of students. Drop-outs and transfers from the University and dismissal from the experiment have reduced our number to fewer than 100 pairs! As a result, we must insist that you appear for this last series of examinations. If you are in the experimental group (which was excused from Rhetoric), please remember that we must hold you for the Rhetoric requirement if you do not complete these examinations. If you are in the control group (which took Rhetoric), please remember that you will be considered not to have completed the Rhetoric requirement if you do not complete these examinations. We hope you find that the exams have been scheduled at convenient times for you; if you see some difficulty in this respect now, see Professor Braddock or his secretary in 4A OAT.

Please report at the following times to take the examinations, bringing a pen or ball point to the theme exams, a #2 pencil to the objective tests. These examinations take precedence over all other events. Note that the Selective Service classification exam does not begin until 1 p.m. on June 3.

Theme:	Wed., May 25,	7-9 p.m.
Theme:	Fri., June 3,	7:30-9:30 a.m.
Objective Tests:	Fri., June 3,	9:30-11:30 a.m.

For each of these tests you are to report according to the following schedule:

Last 2 digits of Univ. No.	Room No.
00 - 33	121-A SH
34 - 66	221-A SH
67 - 99	321-A SH

Yours sincerely,

Dewey B. Stuit

Dewey B. Stuit
Dean

Richard Braddock

Richard Braddock
Coordinator, Rhetoric Program

4A O.A.T.
May 20, 1966

REMINDER

Don't forget the last battery of the Rhetoric experiment examinations!

Wed., May 25, 7-9 p.m.
Theme. Bring pen or ballpoint.

Fri., June 3, 7:30-11:30 a.m.
Theme and objective tests.
Bring #2 pencil and pen or ballpoint.

Each time, please report punctually to the room following the last two digits of your student number:

00-33	121A SH
34-66	221A SH
67-99	321A SH

You deserve much credit for cooperating with the Rhetoric experiment, even when--to make it meaningful--we had to require you and the others to participate. Dean Stuit and I do hope that you will carry your cooperation through to the end by doing your very best on these last examinations. Then we will be able to give you an accurate report of your own writing proficiency and have significant results to justify the effort you have invested in the experiment.

As a modest token of our appreciation of your efforts, we will serve coffee and doughnuts to you and the other particpating students outside 121A SH from 7:00 to 7:20 a.m. on Friday, June 3. We wish that it were possible to show our appreciation in a more substantial manner, but the spirit is there.

Richard Braddock
Coordinator
Rhetoric Program

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

May 18, 1966

Professor Braddock
4A OAT

Dear Sir:

I am a sophomore who was selected for the Rhetoric experimental control group. I have here a letter informing me that I am to report for four hours of testing during final week and two hours of testing during the week immediately preceeding final week, during which I also have final exams. I have never understood why I was chosen to be in the control group or why I was never given any choice in the matter. I have completed the 10:3 program, completed all my other core requirements, and am well into my major. Now I am informed that I must take Rhetoric exams during finals. With these exams hanging over my head, I rather doubt that my final exams will be up to par.

Thus far I have taken these additional exams, done my best, and kept quiet; although growing more hostile towards the program with each set. In every letter received I have read," If you are in the control group (which took Rhetoric) please remember that you will be considered not to have completed the Rhetoric program requirement if you do not complete these examanitions." This serves as a constant reminder that I was forced to take these tests, I didn't volunteer. This has made me very angry. I also read in this particular letter that, "We hope you find that these exams have been scheduled at a convenient time for you;" I cannot believe that anyone who is realy sincere could make this statement when he is fully aware that he has just assigned a set of exams which run from 7:30-11:30 a.m. during finals to college students who will receive absolutely no benefit from the exams.

By this time you have no doubt received several letters such as this one. Nevertheless I do feel that I have a legitimate complaint and I should lodge that complaint wiht the proper persons. If you feel that you have a legitimate explanation or point I am usually available at 353-1045.

Sincerely,
Dennis Lang
Dennis Lang

cc: Dean Stuit

APPENDIX B

RHETORIC EXPERIMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

RHETORIC EXPERIMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
May 25, 1966

My Student Number:________________ (Please make your numbers legible.)

Check One:

( ) I was excused from the Rhetoric requirement. (I was in the experimental group.)

( ) I was not excused from the Rhetoric requirement. (I was in the control group.)

Be sure to read all the responses for each question before answering.

1. When you cameto the U of I your first September, how well prepared were you to do the kinds of writing you have since done in courses other than Rhetoric? (Check only one response.)

( ) 1. Fully prepared. The composition instruction in Rhetoric was not necessary for me.

( ) 2. Rather well prepared. Although Rhetoric might have helped me improve my writing some, I did not need to take Rhetoric to do adequate writing for my other freshman and sophomore courses.

( ) 3. Rather weakly prepared. Although my writing was not bad enough to have lowered my grades in other freshman and sophomore courses without having taken Rhetoric, I would not want to leave my writing at that level.

( ) 4. Quite weakly prepared. My writing in other freshman and sophomore courses (a) would have been weak enough to lower some of my grades if I had not had Rhetoric OR (b) was weak enough that it did lower some of my grades because I did not have Rhetoric.

( ) 5. The question does not pertain to me. (If you check 5, also check either a or b or both below.)

( ) a. I have done no or almost no writing (term papers, essay tests, etc.) for other freshman and sophomore courses.

( ) b. Although my writing needed improvement, (a) Rhetoric did not help it improve OR (b) I did not take Rhetoric, but it would not have helped my writing improve.

more on next page

2. Knowing what you know now, if you were an entering freshman at U of I and Rhetoric was an elective, not a required subject, which of the following would you do? (Check only one response.)

- ☐ 1. Not take Rhetoric or any other freshman or upperclass college course offering instruction in expository and argumentative writing.
- ☐ 2. Not take Rhetoric as a freshman, but plan to elect, as an upperclassman, a two-hour course in expository and argumentative writing.
- ☐ 3. Not take Rhetoric as a freshman, but plan to elect, as an upperclassman, a four-hour Rhetoric course (expository and argumentative speaking and writing.
- ☐ 4. Take Rhetoric as a freshman unless, as under the system now extended to all freshmen who do well on the ACT tests, I was able during Registration Week to write a theme and deliver a speech which met the Rhetoric Program standards for exemption.
- ☐ 5. Take Rhetoric as a freshman even though I could exempt myself at the outset by examination.
- ☐ 6. Take Rhetoric as a freshman in any event and plan to take, as an upperclassman, an additional two-hour course in expository and argumentative writing.

3. Which of the following writing work have you taken while at U of I other than the regular Rhetoric work? (Check either answer 7 or one or more of answers 1-6.)

- ☐ 1. At least four individual lessons in a correspondence course in composition.
- ☐ 2. At least four individual sessions of voluntary, non-credit work in the Rhetoric Writing Laboratory.
- ☐ 3. Rhetoric 10:9.
- ☐ 4. One of the following courses: Expository Writing, Beginning Reporting, Magazine Article Writing, Business Writing, or Technical Writing.
- ☐ 5. Undergraduate Writer's Workshop: Poetry.
- ☐ 6. Undergraduate Writer's Workshop: Fiction.
- ☐ 7. I have taken none of the work listed in answers 1-6.

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS

WRITING THEMES

Print your name legibly here ________________________________
(Last name) (First) (Initial)

Your student number ______________________

200

Experiment in the Effectiveness of College Composition
September, 1964

Follow these directions carefully:

1. Do NOT write your name, date or instructor's name on the theme booklet cover or anywhere in the theme booklet. DO write your student number at the upper right-hand corner of the theme booklet cover and your name and number at the top of this sheet. The ID number you use for this test is your 6-digit University ID number.

2. Select one of these general subjects and write it on the cover of the theme booklet.

A Lesson Learned in Childhood	A Natural (Not Man-Made) Event or Object
A Historical Event Prior to 1960	What Makes ________ Beautiful (or Ugly)

NOTE: As you plan your paper and write it, please avoid including anything in your theme which will date it. That is, the theme graders should not find any references to very recent events, your age, your educational status, or the like. Two years from now, when this theme and a theme you will write then are rated, the graders should not be able to determine which theme is which except by noting improvement of your thinking and writing.

3. Narrow this general subject to a specific topic that you can explain adequately in two hours. Note that the writing is to be an explanation, not an argument nor a narrative.

Example: Suppose the general topic is "The Theater." This can be limited until the topic actually used is something like one of the following:

Why I Prefer Character Parts	Hamlet's Insanity
What Makes a Good Prompter	The Form of the TV Western

4. Outline the theme, using the back of the front cover. (The outline will not be graded.)

5. Write the theme, beginning on the next page. If you think you have time, you may write a rough draft on the scratch paper provided and copy it into the theme booklet.

   a. Be sure your theme is an explanation, not an argument nor a narrative.

   b. Avoid merely "discussing" a topic; develop a clear, central idea.

   c. Develop your points with specific material: facts, examples, illustrations, concrete details, even charts and graphs if relevant.

   d. Follow the organization of your outline.

   e. Write a substantial paper. In length it should be at least 450 words.

   f. Use standard English.

   g. Take two full hours. Do not try to cut the time short.

6. Check your writing carefully for grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

7. Turn in all material, including scratch paper.

NOTE: Any student detected consulting another student or referring to material brought into the examination room will be reported to the College

1st grader ____________( )

2nd grader ____________( )

Total ________________

Theme #2 (ETS)

Second grader ( )

Grade ________________

Student number ________________

First grader ( ) 47

Grade ________________

Student number ________________

THEME INSTRUCTIONS

1085

1. The paper which you are about to write will be judged on your success in presenting your thoughts in a clear, unified, well-organized manner, observing the conventions of standard written English. You should think about the topic until you have determined what idea you want to convey to the reader and the general procedure you will follow in doing so. Then you may write your paper. Do not hesitate to make a brief outline **if you desire to do so** (use the back of this sheet). An outline is **not** required.

2. You should write as neatly and legibly as you can, but you should not hesitate to make changes between the lines if you believe them to be necessary. You do not have to copy the paper over.

3. WRITE ON ONE SIDE OF THE PAPER ONLY. If you need more paper, ask for it.

4. Begin on the third line of the first sheet, and WRITE ON EVERY LINE THEREAFTER.

5. You must write with INK or BALL-POINT PEN.

6. Be certain to write your STUDENT NUMBER in each of the blanks (two at the top, one at the bottom) provided for it on this sheet, and in the upper right-hand corner of **each page** of your theme.

7. Turn in all of the paper given to you.

8. You must stay at least one hour and fifteen minutes.

9. LENGTH: 300 - 500 words.

TOPIC

Today a young man who wears a beard or a girl who prefers slacks to skirts has difficulty in finding employment in most work which serves the public. Changes in fashion are announced one day and adopted the next. In business, promotions are made with great emphasis upon how well an individual meets the "image" the employer wishes to create. In school, those who do as they are told and give the answers expected of them are rated high by many of the faculty; those who do what "everyone else" does are popular with the students.

Now consider a famous quotation: "Whoso would be a man must be a non-conformist."

Relate the material in the opening paragraph to the quotation, indicating whether, on the basis of your observation and experience, you feel the idea expressed in the quotation is true.

Student Number ________________

College or University ________________

Your Name ________________
last first middle initial

506

Print your name legibly here ____
(Last name) (First) (Initial)

Your student number ____________________

Experiment in the Effectiveness of College Composition
May, 1966

Follow these directions carefully:

1. Do NOT write your name, date or instructor's name on the theme booklet cover or anywhere in the theme booklet. DO write your student number at the upper right-hand corner of the theme booklet cover and your name and number at the top of this sheet. The ID number you use for this test is your 6-digit University ID number.

2. Select one of these general subjects and write it on the cover of the theme booklet.

   A Lesson Learned in Childhood
   A Historical Event Prior to 1960
   A Natural (Not Man-Made) Event or Object
   What Makes __________ Beautiful (or Ugly)

   NOTE: As you plan your paper and write it, please avoid including anything in your theme which will date it. That is, the theme graders should not find any references to events of the past three years, your age, your educational status, or the like. Next month, when this theme and the themes you wrote two years ago are rated, the graders should not be able to determine which theme is which except by noting improvement of your thinking and writing.

3. Narrow this general subject to a specific topic that you can explain adequately in two hours. Note that the writing is to be an explanation, not an argument nor a narrative.

   Example: Suppose the general topic is "The Theater." This can be limited until the topic actually used is something like one of the following:

   Why I Prefer Character Parts
   What Makes a Good Prompter
   Hamlet's Insanity
   The Form of the TV Western

4. Outline the theme, using the back of the front cover. (The outline will not be graded.)

5. Write the theme, beginning on the next page. If you think you have time, you may write a rough draft on the scratch paper provided and copy it into the theme booklet.

   a. Be sure your theme is an explanation, not an argument nor a narrative.
   b. Avoid merely "discussing" a topic; develop a clear, central idea.
   c. Develop your points with specific material; facts, examples, illustrations, concrete details, even charts and graphs if relevant.
   d. Follow the organization of your outline.
   e. Write a substantial paper. In length it should be at least 450 words.
   f. Use standard English.
   g. Take two full hours. Do not try to cut the time short.

6. Check your writing carefully for grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

7. Turn in all material, including scratch paper.

NOTE: Any student detected consulting another student or referring to material brought into the examination room will be reported to the College Disciplinary Board.

Theme #4 (ETS)

TOTAL SCORE ☐ | **Second Reader** (#) | **Score** ☐ | **First Reader** (#) | **Score** ☐

Student Number: ____________

THEME INSTRUCTIONS

1. The paper which you are about to write will be judged on your success in presenting your thoughts in a clear, unified, well-organized manner, observing the conventions of standard written English. You should think about the topic until you have determined what idea you want to convey to the reader and the general procedure you will follow in doing so. Then you may write your paper. Do not hesitate to make a brief outline if you desire to do so (use the back of this sheet). An outline is not required.
2. You should write as neatly and legibly as you can, but you should not hesitate to make changes between the lines if you believe them to be necessary. You do not have to copy the paper over.
3. WRITE ON ONE SIDE OF THE PAPER ONLY. If you need more paper, ask for it.
4. Begin on the third line of the first sheet, and WRITE ON EVERY LINE THEREAFTER.
5. You must write with INK or BALL-POINT PEN.
6. Be certain to write your STUDENT NUMBER in the blank provided at the top of this instruction sheet in the upper left-hand corner under the Total Score box. It should also be written on each page of your theme. Do NOT write your name, or the name of your school, in any place other than the blank provided at the bottom of this sheet.
7. Turn in all of the paper given to you.
8. You must stay at least one hour and fifteen minutes.
9. LENGTH: 300 - 500 words.

TOPIC

Conventional is a word frequently used to refer to customary attitudes, beliefs or actions. In the United States it is a convention for men to be clean-shaven, women to wear a certain amount of make-up, boys to be interested in sports, and girls to be interested in becoming wives and mothers. A person who is unconventional in some way departs from the conventions of action or belief of the society of which he is a part.

With this explanation in mind, discuss the following statement:

"Convention is society's safeguard, but also its potential executioner." To what extent and in what ways do you agree with this statement? Use examples and details from your knowledge and experience to support your conclusion.

____
(Last Name) (First Name) (Middle Initial)

____
(College or University)

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS TO RATERS

INSTRUCTIONS TO RATERS OF EXPERIMENT THEMES

1. Your purpose should be to rate each paper as accurately as you can, without attempting in any way to determine who wrote the paper or when it was written. Rate the experiment themes just as you would final theme examinations in the Rhetoric Program except for the following deviations.

2. MAKE NO MARKS ON ANY OF THE THEMES.
Confine all your notes and marks to scratch paper and theme score sheets until you are ready to place your ratings on the cover sheet of the theme booklet. Make no marks whatsoever inside the theme booklet except for a faint star at the end of the line in which you estimate the 400th word to fall.

3. Disregard the Rhetoric Program letter grade system. That is, rate merely to assign numbers; do not give a "14F," for instance, if a theme merits a "1" in some category.

4. Reconcile each of the five category ratings so that you and your rating partner are never more than one point apart. Reconcile the total score so that you are never more than two points apart. THEN ADD YOUR TWO TOTAL SCORES TO YIELD A SUM, not an average total. This sum must be a whole number, with no fractions or decimals. (Thus if your total was 15 and your partner's was 17, your total rating would be 32.) Be sure to check your addition after you enter your ratings on the cover sheet.

5. Inasmuch as the students had no access to dictionaries when they wrote these themes, deduct only two points under "Literacy" for each misspelled word the first time it is misspelled. (As usual, deduct only one point for a clear error in hyphenating or compounding words. As usual, do not count a variant spelling as an error; if in doubt, consult a list of variant spellings which Mr. Braddock has.)

6. Although you may consult Mr. Braddock about hypothetical, grammatical and mechanical problems if you feel the need, do not ask him to resolve differences of opinion about the rating of a category on any specific theme. He should not be permitted to affect your ratings and hence, though unintentionally, to bias the experiment.

7. If one of the themes written in an Examination Service booklet reveals clearly whether it was written this spring or two years ago, rate the theme and reconcile your scores as usual, without mentioning the date to your rating partner. After you have completed your reconciling, ask your partner whether or not he recognized the date of writing. Then bring the theme to Mr. Braddock.

8. Instruction sheets for the themes are attached. Note that two of the instruction sheets differ from the kind usually employed in the Rhetoric Program. Use the same procedures in rating each type of theme, however.

Rhetoric Program
University of Iowa
June 8, 1966

INSTRUCTIONS FOR STANDARD RATING OF THEMES

To achieve as consistent theme ratings as possible, the Rhetoric Program has developed a standard method of grading which is used for all placement and final themes and which instructors use frequently during the semester. The method consists of analyzing a theme into five major aspects --central idea and analysis, supporting material, organization, expression, and literacy. By rating each of these categories from 1 to 5 (F to A) and totalling the five ratings, the instructor sees "the whole theme" as well as its various aspects. Periodic practice rating sessions of the entire Rhetoric faculty further develop consistency from instructor to instructor.

A discussion of each of the five major aspects follows.

Central Idea and Analysis

The "C" paper clearly states or implies a reasonably restricted thesis or proposition on a significant subject which is appropriate to the assignment. The purpose of the theme is expository, argumentative, or critical, as the assignment requires, and is not principally narrative or descriptive. If otherwise the pertinence would not be clear, the introduction shows the relation of the central idea to the assigned topic. Once the narrowed central idea is made clear, usually by the end of the introduction, the theme continues to focus on that idea throughout the paper. Key terms are defined when necessary. The body of the paper is clearly divided into an appropriate number of significant steps, reasons, issues, or other considerations of approximately equal or ascending importance which lead the reader to understand or even to accept the central idea.

The "B" or "A" paper presents a central idea which is especially challenging or significant for freshmen. The analysis reflects superior understanding of the issues or other considerations involved and, in the best papers, relates these meaningfully and interestingly to the concerns of the reader.

The "D" or "F" paper may deal with a subject which is trite or inconsequential even for freshmen. It presents a main idea which is vague or too broad, or it wanders from one thread of a topic to another without weaving them into a unified pattern of development. Frequently the paper contains a number of paragraphs only two or three sentences in length. The theme may seem to have been written merely to fulfill the assignment, not to communicate. If the theme clearly does not fulfill a major consideration of the assignment, the paper does not deserve to pass.

Supporting Material

The "C" paper explains or supports its general statements with enough relevant facts, figures, specific instances, quotations, or other details to make the paper clear. The supporting material may be drawn largely from the student's experience, or it may be obtained by reading or other means. After it has been made clear that a student is expected to acknowledge the sources of his information and quotations, he does this, either by footnotes or by informal mention in the text of the paper.

The "B" or "A" paper qualified its statements and supports them more concretely, perhaps even with fresh and interesting details. The best papers indicate the conclusiveness of supporting evidence, showing that an instance or illustration is typical, or that a sample is representative. If they present material which is surprising to the reader, they do so with an awareness that special explanation or reassurance is necessary.

The "D" or "F" paper may contain a considerable amount of material which is irrelevant, overobvious, contradictory, or biased. Rather than offer evidence, it may depend upon hypothetical example, forced analogy, or mere rhetoric. Note: Instructors are required to report cases of suspected or outright plagiarism to the Chairman of Student Relations. (See page 2.5.)

Organization

The "C" paper employs an introduction, body, and conclusion, although in short papers the introduction and conclusion may not always be long enough to occupy separate paragraphs. The introduction makes clear the purpose or central idea of the theme. Each paragraph of the body presents or implies a clear topic sentence, and explains or supports the topic in a unified manner. Transitions from paragraph to paragraph are clear, though not always smooth. The conclusion restates and emphasizes the central idea without introducing new material or irrelevancies.

The "B" or "A" paper introduces the central idea so that it engages the concern or interest of the reader. The paragraphs often have internal divisions and transitions, perhaps using such techniques as comparison and contrast, cause and effect, or problem and solution. The conclusion is emphatic, often suggesting the larger significance of the restricted central idea.

The "D" or "F" paper has little apparent pattern of development or one which depends upon such rudimentary transitions as "firstly," "secondly," and "thirdly" or an excessive use of introductory rhetorical questions. The introduction and conclusion often are terse to the point of abruptness.

Expression

In "Expression," the "C" paper shows evidence of being moderately concise and varied in diction and sentence style without too many errors or infelicities. The indicated number of points for the following types of errors is totalled, and the sum is converted into the rating indicated in the scale below.

Two points are added for each example of extensive wordiness, loosely strung out sentence, wrong word meaning, excessive coordination, unnecessary shift in subject or verb, poor parallelism, dangling or squinting modifier, and unclear or illogical word order or subordination.

One point is added for each example of trite diction, ambiguity, unintended connotation, deadwood, ineffective repetition, and unidiomatic use of a preposition or other word.

Conversion Scale for " Expression"

Total Points per 400 words:	21 and over	16-20	11-15	6-10	0-5
Rating:	F (1)	D (2)	C (3)	B (4)	A (5)

The rating for "Expression" may be raised or lowered one step if the total points do not seem adequately to reflect the rater's general impression of the expressiveness of the paper.

Literacy

"Literacy" is rated in much the same way as "Expression" except that special provision is made to prevent a paper from being drawn into the "B" or "A" bracket merely because of an absence of gross errors.

Add five points for each run-on sentence and each bad sentence fragment and comma splice.

Add three points for each misspelled word the first time it is misspelled. Variant spellings are not misspellings. (If in doubt, consult Donald Emery's Variant Spellings in Modern American Dictionaries, NCTE, 1958.) The three point penalty is based on the assumption that the student has access to a desk dictionary.

Add two points for each example of subject-verb disagreement, pronoun-antecedent disagreement, unclear pronoun reference, incorrect verb form, non-stylistic omission, and other strikingly ungrammatical construction. Also add two points for each clearly erroneous use of period, colon, semicolon, question mark, and quotation marks.

Add one point for each error in hyphenation or compounding of words, capitalization, and punctuation not covered above, and for each example of carelessness.

Conversion Scale for "Literacy"

Total Points per 400 words:	21 and over	11-20	0-10
Rating:	F (1)	D (2)	C (3)

Certainly the adequate paper should be written or typed clearly, with reasonably neat margins, in a theme booklet or on appropriate paper. Appropriate paper is white bond (not onion skin) measuring 8 1/2" by 11" and not having the frayed edge of a page torn from a spiral binding. If out-of-class themes are not typed, they should be written in ink, never in pencil in the final draft. The final draft should be proofread carefully before it is submitted, last-minute corrections being neatly written in ink and excisions made with a single line. If footnotes or a bibliography is included , some acceptable and consistent style should be followed. If a manuscript deviates markedly from this form, its rating for "Literacy" is lowered one or two steps.

Points are counted on placement and final themes (which must be rated by a deadline) only through the first 400 words. As one step in achieving consistent ratings, the following procedure is used in estimating this length.

1. Count the total number of words (including short prepositions, etc.) in six lines of representative length distributed throughout the theme. Using the table here, find the approximate number of lines which 400 words take in this theme.

Total No. Wds. in Six Lines	No. of Lines for 400 Wds.	Words	Lines	Words	Lines
29	83	40	60	52	46
30	80	42	57	54	44
32	75	44	54	56	43
34	70	46	52	58	41
36	67	48	50	60	40
38	63	50	48	70	34

2. Beginning with the first line of the theme, count lines until you reach the number obtained from the table above. (Make adjustments if several partial lines are included at the ends of paragraphs.) Place a star (*) at the end of that line so you will know where to stop counting and so your rating partner will not have to duplicate the procedure. If the theme has fewer than 400 words, adjust the rating of each of the categories downward proportionally.

APPENDIX E

EXPERIENCE OF RATERS

EXPERIENCE OF RATERS

Sargent Bush. Princeton, AB in English; Iowa, MA in English. Two years of teaching in Rhetoric Program. Article published in *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 1965.

Ellen Fox. Iowa, BA and MA in English. Two years of teaching in Rhetoric Program; no previous teaching experience.

Benjamin Hodge. Princeton, AB in English; Iowa, MA in Speech and Dramatic Art. Two years of teaching in Rhetoric Program; two years teaching English in the Loomis School, Connecticut; two years teaching English as a second language in the Niamey Schools, Niger Republic.

Nancy Holmes. Kansas, BA in English; Iowa, MFA in English. Two years of teaching in Rhetoric Program. Editor, Hallmark Cards, four years; free lance book reviewer, Kansas City *Star*, two years; six poems and a short story published in literary quarterlies; award in national poetry competition.

Deborah Hawkins Horne. Iowa, BA in English. One year of teaching in Rhetoric Program; one year teaching American literature in LaFollette High School; two years teaching English and French, Southeast Junior High School, Iowa City.

Paul Jensen. Columbia, BA in English; Union Theological, BD; Iowa, MA in English. Two years of teaching in Rhetoric Program; one semester of student teaching in English, Pacific Palisades High School. A sketch and a story published in literary quarterlies.

Belden Johnson. Harvard, BA in American History and Literature. One year of teaching in Rhetoric Program; two years of private tutoring in English, American history, and mathematics at Harvard. Two stories and a poem published in undergraduate literary magazine.

Michael Kelly. University of South Florida, BA in Speech and English. One year of teaching in Rhetoric Program. Editorial work on undergraduate literary monthly.

Larry Kramer. Ohio State, BA and MA in English. One year of teaching in Rhetoric Program; two years of teaching freshman English at Ohio State; two years of teaching freshman English at Missouri. Several poems published by literary quarterlies; poetry prize at Ohio State.

Robert Miller. Tufts, BA in Drama. One year of teaching in Rhetoric Program. Wrote and edited for high school and undergraduate papers.

Edward Pixley. Concordia College, BA in English and Speech; Wisconsin, MA in Speech and Drama. Two years of teaching in Rhetoric Program; one year of teaching public address at Wisconsin; four years of teaching speech and English at Waldorf College.

Stanley Renner. Iowa, BA in English, all courses for Ph.D. in English. One year of teaching in Rhetoric Program. Three years of industrial journalism, two years as editor of house organ for 20,000 employees, Bell System in Chicago.

Gary Stewart. Brigham Young, BS and MS in Drama; Iowa, all courses for Ph.D. in Speech and Dramatic Art. Three years of teaching in Rhetoric Program; one year teaching speech at Brigham Young; one year teaching humanities at Southern Illinois.

Edwin Weihe. Brown, BA in English; Iowa, MA and MFA in English. One year of teaching in Rhetoric Program; one year teaching English, algebra and social studies at Maret School, Washington, D. C. Book reviews published in *Studies in Short Fiction*; short stories published in undergraduate literary magazine.

APPENDIX F

ANALYSES OF THEME RATINGS

TABLE 8

MEANS OF BETTER SCORES ON THEME 3 OR 4*

Central Idea and Analysis

	E	C	row
L_3	6.50	7.00	6.75
L_2	5.39	5.74	5.57
L_1	5.57	5.07	5.32
col.	5.49	5.70	

Differences between levels significant at the .05 level with an observed F of 3.25.

Supporting Material

	E	C	row
L_3	6.18	5.54	5.86
L_2	6.05	6.10	6.08
L_1	6.40	5.80	6.10
col.	6.10	5.98	

Nothing significant.

Organization

	E	C	row
L_3	6.20	7.60	6.90
L_2	5.90	6.11	6.00
L_1	6.07	5.11	5.59
col.	5.95	6.02	

Interaction differences between E and C significant by levels at the .05 level with an observed F of 3.64.

Expression

	E	C	row
L_3	6.90	7.80	7.35
L_2	6.78	6.56	6.67
L_1	6.68	6.46	6.57
col.	6.77	6.62	

Nothing significant.

Literacy

	E	C	row
L_3	5.80	5.60	5.70
L_2	5.34	5.20	5.27
L_1	5.00	4.86	4.93
col.	5.31	5.17	

Nothing significant.

Total Score

	E	C	row
L_3	31.80	33.80	32.80
L_2	29.46	29.71	29.58
L_1	29.50	27.04	28.27
col.	29.61	29.46	

Differences between levels significant at the .10 level with an observed F of 2.92.

---

* An individual's score is the sum of the ratings of the two raters on the theme on which the individual made the better score.

TABLE 9

MEANS OF SUMS OF SCORES ON THEMES 3 AND 4*

Central Idea and Analysis

	E	C	row
L_3	11.10	11.90	11.50
L_2	10.01	10.09	10.05
L_1	9.68	8.86	9.27
col.	10.02	9.99	

Nothing significant.

Supporting Material

	E	C	row
L_3	11.00	11.00	11.00
L_2	10.38	10.56	10.47
L_1	9.96	9.32	9.64
col.	10.34	10.37	

Nothing significant.

Organization

	E	C	row
L_3	11.20	12.40	11.80
L_2	10.76	10.93	10.84
L_1	10.39	9.64	10.02
col.	10.72	10.80	

Differences between levels significant at the .05 level with an observed F of 2.78.

Expression

	E	C	row
L_3	13.00	13.40	13.20
L_2	12.73	12.36	12.54
L_1	12.07	12.29	12.18
col.	12.63	12.41	

Nothing significant.

Literacy

	E	C	row
L_3	11.40	11.10	11.25
L_2	10.43	10.02	10.22
L_1	9.71	9.79	9.75
col.	10.36	10.04	

Nothing significant.

Total Score

	E	C	row
L_3	57.70	57.80	58.75
L_2	54.29	53.96	54.13
L_1	51.82	49.89	50.86
col.	54.07	53.60	

Differences between levels significant at the .10 level with an observed F of 3.07.

---

* An individual's score is the sum of the ratings of the two raters on each of the two themes.

TABLE 10

MEAN GAINS BETWEEN BETTER THEMES*

Central Idea and Analysis

	E	C	row
L_3	20.70	21.80	21.25
L_2	20.33	20.75	20.54
L_1	20.71	20.07	20.39
col.	20.42	20.70	

Nothing significant.

Supporting Material

	E	C	row
L_3	20.60	21.00	20.88
L_2	20.70	20.88	20.79
L_1	21.11	20.64	20.80
col.	20.77	20.85	

Nothing significant.

Organization

	E	C	row
L_3	21.50	20.14	20.82
L_2	20.68	20.69	20.68
L_1	20.60	21.60	21.10
col.	20.82	20.65	

Interaction differences between E and C significant by levels at the .10 level with an observed F of 2.95.

Expression

	E	C	row
L_3	20.30	21.40	20.85
L_2	20.26	20.12	20.19
L_1	21.21	20.32	20.77
col.	20.43	20.23	

Nothing significant.

Literacy

	E	C	row
L_3	21.00	20.20	20.60
L_2	19.98	20.13	20.05
L_1	20.11	20.29	20.20
col.	20.06	20.17	

Nothing significant.

Total Score

	E	C	row
L_3	23.20	26.00	24.60
L_2	21.94	22.58	22.26
L_1	24.64	21.46	23.05
col.	22.50	22.60	

Nothing significant.

---

*An individual's score is the difference between the better posttest theme and the better pretest theme. A constant of 20.00 has been added to each score.

TABLE 11

MEAN GAINS BETWEEN THEMES 1 and 3*

Central Idea and Analysis

	E	C	row
L_3	20.90	21.30	21.10
L_2	20.26	20.73	20.49
L_1	21.32	20.93	21.13
col.	20.49	20.80	

Nothing significant.

Supporting Material

	E	C	row
L_3	20.60	20.80	20.70
L_2	20.38	20.97	20.68
L_1	20.68	20.71	20.70
col.	20.45	20.91	

Nothing significant.

Organization

	E	C	row
L_3	20.60	20.60	20.60
L_2	20.47	20.78	20.62
L_1	20.96	20.64	20.80
col.	20.56	20.75	

Nothing significant.

Expression

	E	C	row
L_3	20.30	20.00	20.15
L_2	20.40	19.98	20.19
L_1	20.64	20.61	20.63
col.	20.44	20.10	

Difference between E and C significant at the .05 level with an observed F of 4.27.

Literacy

	E	C	row
L_3	21.00	19.40	20.20
L_2	20.13	20.16	20.14
L_1	20.21	20.21	20.21
col.	20.20	20.12	

Nothing significant.

Total Score

	E	C	row
L_3	23.40	22.10	22.75
L_2	21.63	22.62	22.13
L_1	23.82	23.11	23.46
col.	22.13	22.67	

Nothing significant.

* An individual's score is the difference between the two themes. A constant of 20.0 has been added to each score.

TABLE 12

MEAN SUBTOTALS OF FIRST THREE CATEGORIES:

Central Idea and Analysis,

Supporting Material, and Organization*

Means of Better Scores
on Theme 3 or 4

	B	C	row
L_3	19.10	20.40	19.75
L_2	17.53	18.00	17.76
L_1	17.82	15.71	16.77
col.	17.[illegible]8	17.75	

Nothing significant.

Means of Sums of Scores
on Themes 3 and 4

	B	C	row
L_3	33.30	35.30	34.30
L_2	31.14	31.58	31.36
L_1	30.04	27.82	28.93
col.	31.08	31.15	

Nothing significant.

Mean Gains Between
Better Themes

	B	C	row
L_3	21.90	24.40	23.15
L_2	21.82	22.33	22.07
L_1	23.18	20.86	22.02
col.	22.06	22.20	

Nothing significant.

Mean Gains Between
Themes 1 and 3

	B	C	row
L_3	22.10	22.70	22.40
L_2	21.11	22.48	21.79
L_1	22.96	22.89	22.63
col.	21.50	22.46	

Nothing significant.

---

* See Tables 8-11, which this table supplements.

APPENDIX G

REPORT ON THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF SPEECH INSTRUCTION
IN THE RHETORIC PROGRAM

Report on the Effectiveness of Speech Instruction in the Rhetoric Program

John Waite Bowers*
University of Iowa

Introduction. The Rhetoric Program at the University of Iowa combines instruction in writing, speaking, reading, and listening skills, emphasizing the commonality of rhetorical principles across all modes of communication. In the typical Rhetoric class (4 s.h.), a student writes eleven themes, gives eight speeches, and fulfills about eight reading and listening assignments. These assignments and the accompanying instruction are divided about evenly between exposition and argument.

In the fall of 1964, more than three hundred students were excused from the Rhetoric requirement in an attempt to analyze differences in the writing, at various intervals, of students who do and students who do not take the course. The experiment reported here "hitch-hiked" on the writing experiment to determine the effect of speech instruction in Rhetoric.

Subjects. During the fall semester, 40 subjects were randomly chosen from the no-Rhetoric pool of subjects (hereafter referred to as 10:6 subjects). These subjects were then matched on the bases of sex and ACT scores with 40 subjects taking 10:3 (accelerated Rhetoric) at that time (hereafter referred to as 10:3 subjects). Although every effort was made to test all subjects selected (see Addendum A), a few subjects were lost. The group finally tested included 38 10:3 subjects and 36 10:6 subjects.

The rating instrument. Members of the Rhetoric faculty developed a rating instrument consisting of 50 bi-polar, seven-level scales organized under the concepts "Content," "Language," and "Delivery." This instrument was pre-tested by having 11 raters use it on a film containing 5 student speeches. The resulting ratings were correlated across raters and across scales. On the basis of these correlations, 15 scales were discarded so that the final rating instrument (Addendum B) consisted of 35 scales organized under the 3 concepts. These scales were further divided into nine relatively independent clusters which we labeled (1) analysis/supporting material, (2) perception of argument, (3) audience adaptation, (4) evidence documentation, (5) confidence, (6) fluency, (7) language appropriateness, (8) enthusiasm/activity, and (9) oral style.

The raters. Raters in all phases of the experiment were Rhetoric instructors hired through the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art who had at least one year's experience teaching in the Program.

---

*Professor Sam Becker provided extensive and valuable help in the development and interpretation of statistical data on the rating instrument.

On the basis of the pre-test of the rating instrument, the 3 least reliable raters were dropped from the study. In the testing session, each speech was rated by two raters paired on the basis of high inter-rater agreement in the pre-test of the rating instrument. Raters had no way of knowing which subjects were 10:3 and which were 10:6. All raters were paid for their time by the College of Liberal Arts.

The test. The test taken by the students at the end of the semester (Addendum C) was of the form typically used in practical speech tests in the Program. Subjects were given a list of general topics and instructed to prepare a four- to five-minute argumentative speech on one of them in a fifty-minute period. They then were divided into groups of 10 and sent to classrooms where they delivered their speeches for their peers and the two raters.

Results. A t-test for the difference between two means showed that the 10:3 students performed significantly better than did the 10:6 students ($t=2.54$, $p<.01$). The mean difference was 24.27, the range of scores 193. Mean scores of 10:3 students were also higher than mean scores of 10:6 students on each of the 9 independent categories (see section on The rating instrument). The chi square statistic indicates $p<.025$ for this consistent superiority.

Interpretation. Instruction in speech in the Rhetoric Program significantly affects student speech behavior in what the Rhetoric faculty considers desirable directions.

ADDENDUM A

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA 52240

The Rhetoric Program

January 6, 1965

Dear___________:

Whether or not you are continuing to have a part in the Rhetoric experiment, we ask that you take part in a brief, supplementary experiment this January.

The conditions of the regular experiment affort an unusual opportunity to test the effectiveness of the Rhetoric Program instruction in speech as well as in writing. As you can readily see, it is of considerable importance to know what kind of effect Rhetoric has on the speaking performance of the different kinds of students required to take the course. Consequently, we have selected you, along with other students from the experimental and control groups, to take a special speech examination at the time and place checked below:

_____Friday, January 15, 6:30-8:30 p.m. 121-A SH
_____Friday, January 15, 7:30-9:30 p.m. 121-A SH

Please write the time and place on your calendar now. It is necessary for you to appear promptly. This examination takes precedence over all other events. We hope that by scheduling the exam early on Friday evening we have minimized any interference with your personal affairs. If it is important for you to take the exam at the time other than the one for which you have been scheduled, please telephone Professor John Bowers, Speech Supervisor of the Rhetoric Program, Ext. 2069, by Monday, January 11.

The speech examination, like the regular Rhetoric final speech exam, will consist of two phases: (1) when you arrive at 121-A SH, you will be given a list of topics from which you will select one on which you will have fifty minutes to prepare a four-minute extemporaneous speech, and (2) when you are notified by the proctor, you will go to another room where you will take turns with seven other students to deliver the speech for rating by several specially trained instructors.

If you have been taking 10:3 this semester, this special speech examination will replace the regular Rhetoric final speech exam for you; and, in order to equalize your motivation with that of students in the experimental group, we will consider that you have exempted yourself from the speech aspect of Rhetoric if you take this special examination as indicated, no matter what your rating is. However, we hope that you will live up to the spirit of the experiment and do your best, and we will inform you of your rating so that you will know how well you did. (If a 10:3 student selected for this special speech examination neglects to take it, he will receive an "Incomplete" for his final Rhetoric grade this semester.)

If you are a 10:6 student, excused from the Rhetoric requirement in the first place, we hope that you will take this added examination in the spirit of the experiment, too, and do your best, even though the results will not affect your standing in any way. We will inform you of your rating, too, so that you will know how well you did even though you have not had Rhetoric instruction. (If any 10:6 student selected for this special speech examination neglects to take it, he will be dismissed from the experiment and be required to fulfill the Rhetoric requirement like any other freshman.)

Again, thank you for helping us conduct this supplementary experiment. The results will be important not only for the University of Iowa but for colleges and universities the country over.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Braddock

Richard Braddock
Coordinator, Rhetoric Program

Dewey B. Stuit

Dewey B. Stuit
Dean

ADDENDUM B

DELIVERY

Enthusiastic ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Bored

Face active ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Face passive

Voice active ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Voice passive

Body active ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Body passive

Voice emphatic ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Voice patterned

Manner appropriate to material ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Manner inappropriate to material

Eyes direct ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Eyes lectern-bound or evasive

Body free ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Body lectern-bound

Audience oriented ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Non-adaptive

Personally involved ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Personally uninvolved

Healthy tension ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Extreme tension

Poised ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Terrified

LANGUAGE

Appropriate to audience ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Inappropriate to audience

Fluent ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Painful

Clever ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Dull

Original ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Hackneyed

Easy to follow ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Hard to follow

Conversational ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Stilted

Oral style ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Written style

Natural word order ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Artificial word order

CONTENT

Central idea significant ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Central idea trivial

Analysis clear ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Analysis confused

Evidence focused ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Evidence diffuse

Evidence real ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Evidence hypothetical

Evidence specific ______:______:______:______:______:______:______ Evidence general

Analysis logical _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Analysis illogical

Evidence amplified _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Evidence skeletal

Evidence documented _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Evidence undocumented

Special knowledge _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Common knowledge

Propositions controversial _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Propositions truistic

Content interesting _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Content boring

Adapts to audience beliefs _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Ignores audience beliefs

Demonstrates central idea's importance _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Assumes central idea's importance

Evidence relevant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Evidence irrelevant

Accounts for opposition _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Suppresses, distorts, ignores opposition

ADDENDUM C

RHETORIC PROGRAM

Speech Examination, January 15, 1965

Your assignment is to present a four- to five-minute argumentative speech on one of the topics listed below. The room chairman will enforce the five-minute time limit strictly, so be sure to narrow the topic you choose to a controversial proposition which you can treat adequately in that time. For example, if you chose the topic "Capital Punishment," you might decide to speak on the proposition, "Capital punishment does not deter capital crimes."

You should impress your audience with specific, documented, supporting material and sound reasoning based upon your experience, general knowledge, and specific reading. You may use notes in any way you wish. In general, however, the raters will penalize you for excessive reading or word-for-word memorization of material. Be direct and conversational.

1. Primary education
2. Housing at the U of I
3. Problems in labor
4. State revenue
5. Private schools and the taxpayer
6. Civil rights organizations
7. Right-wing strategies
8. Religion and Congress
9. The U.S. and Europe
10. The cost of dying
11. Art and artists
12. Marriage and divorce
13. Traffic and traffic laws
14. Freedom of speech for students